FIXED PRICE AWARD FEES, MEETING TODAY'S AND TOMORROW'S CHALLENGES

Michael Younce
STRICOM
Orlando, Florida
and
Richard Oswald
Support Service Technical Consultant
Orlando, Florida

Abstract

Department of Defense initiatives in recent years have focused on reinventing the way Government does business with industry. Coupled with these initiatives is the reality of declining budgets without declining requirements. In the arena of contractor maintenance and support of U. S. Army aviation simulators, these problems are compounded for the legacy systems fielded over the past twenty years. Budget constraints, and the promise of new technologically advanced systems being fielded in the coming years, has made sustainment and modernization funds very difficult to acquire. Aging of the legacy systems, with the persistent problems of obsolescence, has made the continued high system availability requirements a difficult challenge.

One method of dealing with this challenge, currently being tested by STRICOM, is the incentive use of Award Fees in conjunction with fixed price contracts. Although this marriage has been allowed by the FAR for some time, Award Fees are most commonly associated with cost plus contracts. Implemented properly, Award Fees have the promise of changing the basic relationship between the buyer and supplier, and greatly enhancing the partnering concept of conducting business. This paper will present an overview of how an Award Fee is being applied on a fixed price Life Cycle Contractor Support program, for aviation training systems. Selection of performance factors, evaluation criteria, determination of the level of award, impact on personnel, lessons learned and suggestions for application to other programs will be presented.

Primary Author's Biography

Mr. Michael Younce manages life cycle contractor support contracts for the Simulation Instrumentation and Training Command in Orlando, FL. During the past 10 years Mr. Younce has managed aviation and ground systems maintenance and operational support programs, which cover multiple, diverse, world wide training sites. Customers include all U. S. Army aviation battalions; and Governments of the Middle East, central Europe, the Far East and Mexico. Mr. Younce has overall program responsibility for assuring a wide range of state-of-the-art simulators are supported, maintained, operated and modernized to meet the day to day training needs of varied customers and training schedules.

Secondary Author's Biography

Mr. Richard Oswald is an engineer currently working in the support service industry providing technical support to the STRICOM Logistics Directorate. He has over thirty years of experience as a project engineer for the Naval Air Warfare Center Training Systems Division, primarily working on the acquisition of U.S. Army aviation simulators. He has extensive experience with the legacy simulators for the Apache, Blackhawk, Chinook and Cobra helicopters. Mr. Oswald has had technical responsibility for acquisition and fielding of major devices at numerous sites in the continental United States, Korea, Germany and Egypt.

FIXED PRICE AWARD FEES, MEETING TODAY'S AND TOMORROW'S CHALLENGES

Michael Younce
STRICOM
Orlando, Florida
and
Richard Oswald
Support Service Technical Consultant
Orlando, Florida

INTRODUCTION

There is a general leaning in the hierarchy of the U. S. Army helicopter training community that the fixed based, so called brick and mortar simulators, are yesterday's solution to the training problem. That the future of simulation, lies in the new generation of collective training devices that will be networked, low in cost, rapidly reconfigurable and portable. These new generation devices are planned to replace the legacy systems, that have been meeting the training requirements for the past twenty plus years. Whether this thinking is correct or not, is not the subject of this paper; but the impact of this evolving concept has created the circumstances, which makes sustainment of the legacy devices a difficult challenge.

STRUCTURE OF A LIFE CYCLE CONTRACTOR SUPPORT CONTRACT

At the Simulation, Training and Instrumentation Command (STRICOM), Life Cycle Contractor Support (LCCS), of non-type classified aviation simulators, has been accomplished under multi-year firm fixed price competitive contracts. The contract, which forms the basis for this paper, is a five-year effort valued at approximately $15 million annually. The basic contract is for an initial period of one year with four, one year, fixed price options. The contract contains both fixed price and time and material line items, and covers 27 sites worldwide. Included in the contract are management of Government inventories of spare parts and test equipment valued in excess of $100 million. The contract calls for maintenance and supply support, operational support, and engineering services to be provided in each of the five countries where the devices are located. Contractor staffing, to maintain the level of support required, averages approximately 200+ people at the installation sites, and in the program office. Included in these totals are about 20 technical staff positions not directly related to maintenance and support functions.

CREATION OF A PENDING CRISIS

The U. S. Army helicopter training program was conceived in the late 60's and has developed into a world class program under the general name of Synthetic Flight Training System or SFTS. This system or plan, fostered the creation of a massive fixed base training program with simulators fielded for the major U. S. Army helicopters including:

UH-1	Iroquois
AH-1	Cobra
UH-60	Blackhawk
MH-60	Special Operations Aircraft
CH-47	Chinook
MH-47	Special Operations Aircraft
AH-64	Apache

The SFTS program started fielding systems in 1970 with the UH-1 Iroquois and ended with delivery of the last AH-64 Apache Combat Mission Simulator in 1995. This equipment has served the Army well, satisfying the schoolhouse, at Ft. Rucker where basic helicopter training is conducted, as well as continuation and refresher training at 27 sites worldwide.

The 1960's SFTS plan concentrated on individual and crew training. The concepts of networked combined arms training, echelon and force on force training were yet to evolve. The total investment cost of this system is well in excess of 3 billion dollars, which includes research and development, initial acquisition, Government furnished equipment and facility costs.

THINKING AND PRIORITIES HAVE CHANGED

Budget cuts over the last eight years have drastically reduced the resources available for maintenance, support and upgrading of these legacy systems.

Modernization of existing systems through wholesale acquisition of the latest major subsystem components is not an economic reality. STRICOM has responded by attempting to foster changes in the competitive process to keep the simulators flying in the face of these reductions. However, the problems of sustaining these systems has begun to compound for the following two reasons.

a. New systems are in the pipeline that will eventually replace this legacy equipment. This has resulted in the annual diversion of resources from the legacy systems to the new concept systems. Unfortunately the promise of the new technology has been delayed, the new systems are not being fielded as anticipated, and the training requirement has not been reduced.

b. The original systems were fielded with the expectation of a maximum life expectancy of fifteen to twenty years. Examination of the fielding dates shows the current average age of the equipment to be approximately 16 years. Component failure rates are increasing, stock replacement is diminishing, and the issues of obsolescence are becoming a daily problem. Without modernization, the prospect of non-operational equipment or routine use of equipment that is only partially mission capable is considered a real threat.

A POSSIBLE SOLUTION

The strategy used at STRICOM to deal with these specific conditions consists of three elements:

a. Partnering

b. Modernization Through Spares (MTS)

c. Award Fee

The partnering concept is a semi-formal program designed to encourage all program participants, contractor and Government, to function as a team with common goals. The program includes training provided by professional facilitators for working level and management level personnel.

Modernization Through Spares is a formal program established through Department of Defense directives and is included as part of the contract. The thrust of the program consists of ongoing and timely analysis of components that are approaching obsolescence. The approach facilitates the ability to plan for the phased replacement of these items in a measured way over time. MTS is a spares improvement strategy applied throughout the equipment life cycle. It is based on technology insertion to enhance systems and extend useful life while reducing costs.

The third and most important part of the solution is the adaptation of the Award Fee to fixed price Life Cycle Contractor Support contracts. Although this application has been permitted by the Federal Acquisition Regulations for about ten years, it has not been widely applied. The advent of Partnering and application of Award Fee shows promise of making the Modernization Through Spares concept work.

The U. S. Air Force has been a leader in the use of Award Fee contracts, and has included a great deal of information on this subject on the Wright Patterson Air Force Base web site. A quick overview of Award Fee can be gleaned from the following five frequently asked question which were obtained directly from the web site at Wright Patterson.

What is it?

Award Fee is a financial incentive used by the Government to motivate the contractor to excel in particular areas. The award fee is determined in accordance with an award fee plan, which is part of the contract. The total available award fee pool is usually negotiated prior to contract award. The amount of the fee earned, is determined by a Fee Determination Official (FDO) using the guidelines in the award fee plan, and is not subject to the dispute clause of the contract.

Why is it important?

Award fee is an effective way for the Government to communicate its satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the contractor's performance. It provides for periodic feedback to the contractor with opportunities for improvement as the contract progresses.

When is it applied?

The award fee incentive is best suited for cost plus efforts with high-risk research and development, where the award fee incentivizes cost control and management activity. However, award fee can be used on any type of contract where it is appropriate. In those cases where the contract allows for other fee, such as firm fixed price or incentive fee

contracts, the award fee will usually not include cost management.

What are the key characteristics?

a. Subjective oriented incentive to motivate the contractor to excel.

b. Very appropriate for research and development, and initial production.

c. May be used on any type and phase of acquisition, especially to emphasize cost control, and management attention.

d. Type Contracts: Straight Cost Plus Award Fee or any other type contract

e. Award Fee Plan is flexible and part of the contract.

f. Government tracks contractor performance and reports to the Award Fee Review Board.

h. Award Fee Review Board makes recommendations to the FDO who determines fee amount

i. Award Fee determination is unilateral and not subject to the Disputes Clause.

j. Excellent feedback tool to contractor at mid-term and final evaluations.

k. Award Fee plus other fees on the contract may not exceed statutory limits.

What is expected from the contractor?

The Government expects the contractor to use the mechanisms set up in the award fee plan to communicate the contractor's assessment of their own performance. In addition, feedback provided to the contractor during mid-term evaluations should be communicated within the company to all personnel affecting the fee. Higher company management should be made aware of problems brought to the attention of lower level personnel. Contractor personnel should elicit feedback from their Government counterparts, seeking opportunities to improve during an award fee period rather than in reaction to the FDO's determination at the end of a period.

APPLICATION OF AWARD FEE TO SFTS

Based upon the above general criteria, award fee provisions were applied to the LCCS contract for the Synthetic Flight Training System. The award fee plan developed, allocates an award fee of 8% of all the fixed price line items. This resulted in an award fee for the first six-month evaluation period of approximately $500,000. The amount of award fee for each successive period will be calculated during that period, but is expected to be nominally about the same for each period of this five-year contract. The total maximum award fee amount must be obligated at the time the contract is executed, and any amount not earned by the contractor is returned to the Treasury. Provisions of the award fee plan include a method of allocating the award fee amount to each of the installation sites, in accordance with the number of contractor personnel assigned to each site. The plan includes provisions for interim evaluations at the 3-month period, and contractor self-assessments. Implementation of the award fee process was not intended to increase overhead or oversight time on the part of the Government. This however, has not proved to be the case for this initial interim evaluation cycle. Once all processes are in place and functional, it is hoped that all future activity in administering the plan will be conducted by currently assigned project personnel as part of their normal duties.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INCENTIVES

Clearly the primary goal of the Life Cycle Contractor Support contract is to maintain the existing equipment in a high state of readiness over an extended period of time. Readiness or availability for training in this particular instance is known as Contractor Performance Factor or CPF. CPF is a calculation of the number of hours that the equipment is available for training, and includes numerous established conditions for determining chargeable downtime. The calculation is made for each device located at each site, and then factored into an average for each site as a whole. Because CPF is a primary concern, this factor is given a relative weight of 45% of the total Award Fee calculation. The remaining 55% is divided among other categories as follows:

FACTOR	***WEIGHT***
Contractor Performance Factor	45%
Customer Satisfaction	10%
Cost Reduction	10%
Cost Control	10%

Program Management	15%
CITIS/LOGARMS/EDI	10%
Total	100%

ESTABLISHMENT OF EVALUATION CRITERIA

The criteria for evaluation of the above factors was based on the perceived need, and the areas where it is considered important for the contractor to be innovative in seeking new solutions. All the factors fall into two distinct categories: site specific and non-site specific. The site-specific factors are CPF and Customer Satisfaction since they are directly related to the effort that the contractor expends in the field at each site. These factors are a direct result of the individual employee's effort on site, in maintaining the equipment and dealing directly with the customer. The remaining factors are primarily the result of management efforts at the home office and the initiatives made by the project team.

The Award Fee Plan of the contract is a very detailed document that informs the contractor of all the factors related to award fee, including how he will be evaluated. The plan for this contract contains 28 pages and is provided on the STRICOM Web site for those desiring more information on the subject. The contract established a period of 2 months as a transition phase to bring the new contractor on board. There were unique award fee factors specifically written for this transition period. The remainder of the five-year contract was divided into six-month evaluation periods. The information below is provided to address the objectives established, which was then translated into evaluation criteria for each of the factors.

Contractor Performance Factor (CPF)

This site-specific factor, is the only factor that does not contain any subjective elements. The calculation of CPF is strictly a mathematical process, resulting in a numerical answer related to the contractor's ability to provide available training hours. Award fee is then calculated for each site independently, and is an average of all the devices at that particular site. The contractor would be able to earn award fee by exceeding 90% on CPF.

Customer Satisfaction

This site-specific factor is a measure of the contractor's responsiveness to the customer's needs on site. In this particular instance, the Government site personnel require support for continually changing training schedules for Army aviators. The desire is for the contractor to remain flexible and support these changing requirements as opposed to being tied to fixed time of day, day of week routines. Interruption of scheduled training periods is also considered a detriment to training. Therefore, the contractor's responsiveness to problems is also considered important, as well as the ability to correct problems in a timely manner. The contractor's relationship with students being trained and non-contractor instructor personnel is also considered important. To measure this factor, a customer satisfaction survey form was developed for trainees and trainers to complete after their scheduled period. This form is being used by the on site Technical Oversight Representatives (TORs), to obtain a sample response of satisfaction, from the aviation community using the devices at that particular site.

Cost Reduction

This non-site specific factor addresses the contractor's efforts to reduce costs both in the long and short term. With the threat of obsolescence, the contractor's actions for the purpose of service life extension are considered critical. The intent here is to foster a practical program to analyze and recommend actions to extend system longevity and sustainability. The program should identify potential component obsolescence, and make adjustments in support methods to reduce failures. Supportable recommendations are desired for the insertion of new technology, where other methods of sustainment such as alternative sources or lifetime buyouts are not practical.

Cost Control

This non-site specific factor addresses the quality of the contractor's engineering change proposals. The objective is to foster the submission of proposals that contain pricing methodology and format which rarely, if ever, vary between proposals. The desire is for proposals to be accurate, stand-alone, require no iteration for Government's understanding and include accurate estimates and support material. The goal is to achieve a level of credibility, that estimates of work, and actual work performed do not deviate to any appreciable extent.

Program Management

The evaluation criteria in the award fee plan for this non-site specific factor contains all the elements that comprise good management. However, the essence of the criteria has its root in the concept of becoming

a partner with the Government in achieving common goals. Emphasis is placed on the establishment of strong working relationships with Government and subcontractor personnel.

CITIS/LOGARMS/EDI

These are acronyms used by STRICOM to establish the requirement for an automated data entry and tracking system for all inventory, technical documentation and deliverables under the contract. The contractor is required to input all information into this system, which is available to all program integrated product team members at all times, in a paperless environment

THE CONTRACTOR'S PERSPECTIVE

In a fixed price environment, prior to contract award, offerors are concerned with three primary things: being competitive, making a profit and being able to perform. The Award Fee pool, normally is a known fixed quantity in the bid process, which in this particular instance was set by the Government at 8% of all fixed price line items. This represents a substantial portion of the overall bid and happens to coincide with the amount one would expect to be included as profit. In a fixed price environment the Government is not privy to the cost elements of the offeror's bids. However, it is suspected that in order to remain competitive offerors based their bids on zero net profit and assumed the risk of a high return on Award Fee to make up the difference. This thinking has the effect of increasing the contractor's cost risk and also the desired effect of concentrating the contractor's focus on performance. Because of this increased risk and pressure on profit, Award Fee is not generally greeted with high reviews from contractors.

A secondary downside affect of this bid structure where the award fee becomes the profit substitute, is the resultant fee or portion thereof will go to shareholders and not be distributed to non-management personnel who, to a large extent have to make the high performance levels happen. In this first fixed price award fee test case by STRICOM, it would appear that the distribution of fee should be split on a 55/45% basis according to the site specific and non-site specific factor ratio. In this particular test case, the contractor has shared his views and several possible formulas for earned award fee distribution. The contractor will probably distribute the award on some other than 55/45% basis, with less than 55% going to non-management employee incentives. Using this comparison, the breakdown may not appear completely equitable; but, under the circumstances, it still leaves a substantial number of dollars for non-management employee incentives.

This share ratio anomaly probably could have been anticipated and measures implemented to assure a larger portion of the award fee is distributed to non-management employees. This is perceived to be a desired result, however, whether this would actually increase performance is an unknown. Current rules do not permit the Government to dictate how the award fee is distributed, and perhaps it is best to let the marketplace determine these factors.

INTERIM RESULTS/LESSONS LEARNED

At the time of this writing, the process is 5 months into the first six-month evaluation period. At the three-month interim evaluation point, the contractor received a collective rating which, would have resulted in his receiving a substantial portion of the maximum award fee for the period.

Self-Assessment

The contractor's self-assessment was comprehensive and valuable in preparing the interim evaluation reports. As might be anticipated, the contractor's assessment was rated higher than the Government's assessment, however it did identify certain areas of achievement, which may otherwise have been overlooked by the evaluators.

Award Fee Plan Modifications

The process of completing the interim evaluation pointed out several areas in the plan requiring modification which were not evident when the plan was initially written. The relative weighting of the factors were changed, as the overall objectives and thrust of the initiatives came into focus. The two cost related factors are in the process of being combined, and stronger emphasis will be placed on the automated data and tracking system. The unilateral ability of the Government to alter the plan as desired during the course of the contract, is critical to achieving results.

Evaluator Training

In this particular application, inputs into the evaluation process are collected from each of the 27 device installations. Uniformity of the evaluations from each of these sites was definitely a problem, and illustrated the need for further training for site personnel performing these evaluations.

Award Fee vs. Profit

Based upon the contractor's perceived apparent willingness to trade off profit against award fee, some clarification of this practice must be addressed. Award fee is not a substitute for profit. In fact, a contractor is clearly not entitled to award fee unless, specific performance levels are exceeded. Furthermore, levels of performance are not reduced because any given contract has award fee provisions included.

.

Impact On Personnel

The primary impact on personnel seems to be a heightened awareness level that the award fee provisions exist, and there is overall program emphasis on performance. This heightened awareness is evident in both Government and contractor personnel, at the sites and in the respective program offices. The current contractor, who was also the incumbent on the previous contract, has changed his entire management structure and introduced different skill types at the management level to address the initiatives of the award fee factors.

Personnel providing Government oversight at the installations, have an additional duty in collecting data on customer satisfaction and completing the evaluation documentation. This additional duty is not considered excessive and formalizes a task they were already doing in other ways. Government site personnel acceptance of this duty is considered very high, since it opens a new line of communication between themselves, their customers and the requiring activity, STRICOM. The customer satisfaction evaluation input also provides the site personnel a direct link to the contract serving their site, which otherwise may seem distant and unreachable.

Overall there seems to be a basic behavioral change in the way business is being conducted. Small but perceptible, this change is related to both award fee and partnering concepts instituted in this program. There definitely is less of the "them and us" attitude, and more of the "how can we make this work", attitude.

Tools

In order to ease the administrative burden and automate the award fee process, a set of spreadsheet form tools were developed. The complete set can be found on the STRICOM web site and are available for possible use and tailoring to other programs. The entire program is paperless, with the exception of the customer survey forms, which are kept at the sites until after the completion of each six-month evaluation period.

A sample performance evaluation report for the factor, Cost Reduction (see Figure 1), contains the key words extracted from the evaluation criteria. Evaluators assign a rating and numerical score based upon the award fee plan instructions. The plan facilitator collects input from all evaluators and enters the data in the Award Fee Calculation spreadsheet (see Figure 2), which computes the total award fee. Figure 2 is a sample test case, which includes assigned ratings at 50% of the maximum achievable. The example shown was developed prior to the completion of the interim evaluation and shows different relative factor ratings than discussed above. Under this award fee plan, the contractor will start earning fees when CPF exceeds 90%, and all the other factors exceed 76%. As shown in the figure, the mid-points are 95% and 88% respectively. It should be noted, that Figure 2 is an example, and is not the actual document used in the contract.

Application To Other Programs

The processes being developed on this program are being refined for application to several new procurements in the pipeline at STRICOM. Programs under consideration for award fee provisions include the following:

ADFAC	Air Defense Field Artillery and Chemical
GMT	Gunnery Maintenance Trainers
C4I	Command, Control Communication, Computers and Intelligence
LT	Live Training

CONCLUSIONS

It is too soon to draw any firm conclusions based on the initial months of this contract. However, some obvious plusses and minuses have been observed. The contractor has surfaced several promising proposals to address obsolescence issues resulting from the Modernization Through Spares program. In the long term, obsolescence will be the

determining factor in system availability. On the minus side, contractor performance factor has not changed appreciably from the previous contract. Changes in CPF are expected to occur gradually however, and without intervention, this measure can only become worse. CPF of course is the ultimate gauge, and the ultimate direction of this number is the challenge. Where this number goes with award fee, MTS and partnering will determine if it really is a means of meeting today's and tomorrow's challenges.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION REPORT / AWARD FEE CALCULATION
TOTAL AWARD POOL $522,765 EVALUATION PERIOD 2a, LOT II
(NON-SITE SPECIFIC FACTOR)

COST REDUCTION

10%
($52,276)

RATING	EXCELLENT	VERY GOOD	SATISFACTORY	UNSATISFACTORY
POSSIBLE SCORE	100-90	89-77	76-61	<61
Service life extension, and cost reduction	Continuing successful program in place, recommendations will clearly result in reduced costs	Established procedures to analyze and recommend actions which show merit	Working towards establishing procedures	Fails to meet satisfactory requirements
Obsolescence	Identifies obsolescence and recommends cost effective technology insertion, provides POM input	Conducts research for alternatives to overcome obsolescence, POM areas identified	Identifies obsolescence issues	Fails to meet satisfactory requirements
Failure reduction	Adjusts methods which result in reduce failures	Analyzes trends for possible improvement	Committed to identifying possible solutions	Fails to meet satisfactory requirements
ASSIGNED RATING				
ASSIGNED POINT VALUE				

AWARD FEE	=IF(RATING<77%,0,(RATING-76%)*$52,276*4.1666)*.1	

EVALUATOR'S RATIONALE AND JUSTIFICATION IN SUPPORT OF THE ABOVE ASSIGNMENTS:

Evaluator's Name: _____ Evaluator's Signature _____ Date_____

Figure 1. Sample Performance Evaluation Report

AWARD FEE CALCULATION
EVALUATION PERIOD 2a LOT II

AWARD POOL $522,765

			50%		10%		7.50%		7.50%		15%		10%	
			SITE SPECIFIC RATINGS				NON SITE SPECIFIC RATINGS							
LINE	SITE	MAXIMUM AWARD FEE	CPF	FEE	CUST. SATISF.	FEE	COST REDUCT.	FEE	COST CONT.	FEE	PROG. MGMT.	FEE	CITIS	FEE	SITE TOTAL AWARD FEE
1	Ft. Belvoir	$ 7,100	95%	$ 1,775	88%	355	88%	266	88%	266	88%	532	88%	355	$ 3,550
2	Ft. Bragg	$ 23,074	95%	$ 5,768	88%	1154	88%	865	88%	865	88%	1730	88%	1154	$ 11,537
3	Ft. Campbell	$ 34,906	95%	$ 8,727	88%	1745	88%	1309	88%	1309	88%	2618	88%	1745	$ 17,453
4	Ft. Carson	$ 14,199	95%	$ 3,550	88%	710	88%	532	88%	532	88%	1065	88%	710	$ 7,100
5	Hanau	$ 16,566	95%	$ 4,141	88%	828	88%	621	88%	621	88%	1242	88%	828	$ 8,283
6	Ft. Hood	$ 28,162	95%	$ 7,040	88%	1408	88%	1056	88%	1056	88%	2112	88%	1408	$ 14,081
7	Camp Humphries	$ 24,612	95%	$ 6,153	88%	1231	88%	923	88%	923	88%	1846	88%	1231	$ 12,306
8	Hunter Army Airfield	$ 14,199	95%	$ 3,550	88%	710	88%	532	88%	532	88%	1065	88%	710	$ 7,100
9	Illesheim	$ 13,962	95%	$ 3,491	88%	698	88%	524	88%	524	88%	1047	88%	698	$ 6,981
10	Ft. Indiantown Gap	$ 26,032	95%	$ 6,508	88%	1302	88%	976	88%	976	88%	1952	88%	1302	$ 13,016
11	Culiacan	$ 4,733	95%	$ 1,183	88%	237	88%	177	88%	177	88%	355	88%	237	$ 2,367
12	Ft. Lewis	$ 16,566	95%	$ 4,141	88%	828	88%	621	88%	621	88%	1242	88%	828	$ 8,283
13	Los Alamitos	$ 11,833	95%	$ 2,958	88%	592	88%	444	88%	444	88%	887	88%	592	$ 5,916
14	Manheim	$ 7,100	95%	$ 1,775	88%	355	88%	266	88%	266	88%	532	88%	355	$ 3,550
15	Marana	$ 30,528	95%	$ 7,632	88%	1526	88%	1145	88%	1145	88%	2290	88%	1526	$ 15,264
16	Peoria	$ 11,833	95%	$ 2,958	88%	592	88%	444	88%	444	88%	887	88%	592	$ 5,916
17	Ft. Riley	$ 16,566	95%	$ 4,141	88%	828	88%	621	88%	621	88%	1242	88%	828	$ 8,283
18	Camp Ripley	$ 7,100	95%	$ 1,775	88%	355	88%	266	88%	266	88%	532	88%	355	$ 3,550
19	Ft. Rucker (Reg. Army)	$ 106,612	95%	$ 26,653	88%	5331	88%	3998	88%	3998	88%	7996	88%	5331	$ 53,306
20	Ft. Rucker (USAARL)	$ 13,844	95%	$ 3,461	88%	692	88%	519	88%	519	88%	1038	88%	692	$ 6,922
21	KKMC	$ 9,466	95%	$ 2,367	88%	473	88%	355	88%	355	88%	710	88%	473	$ 4,733
22	K-16 Seoul	$ 17,749	95%	$ 4,437	88%	887	88%	666	88%	666	88%	1331	88%	887	$ 8,874
23	Wheeler	$ 9,466	95%	$ 2,367	88%	473	88%	355	88%	355	88%	710	88%	473	$ 4,733
24	Ft. Leonard Wood	$ 2,367	95%	$ 592	88%	118	88%	89	88%	89	88%	177	88%	118	$ 1,183
25	Ft. Wainwright	$ 11,833	95%	$ 2,958	88%	592	88%	444	88%	444	88%	887	88%	592	$ 5,916
26	Westover	$ 7,100	95%	$ 1,775	88%	355	88%	266	88%	266	88%	532	88%	355	$ 3,550
27	Ft. Eustis	$ 35,261	95%	$ 8,815	88%	1763	88%	1322	88%	1322	88%	2645	88%	1763	$ 17,630
	TOTAL	**$ 522,765**		**$ 130,691**		**26138**		**19603**		**19603**		**39207**		**26138**	**$ 261,380**

Note: This sample is a spreadsheet test with assigned ratings at 50% of the maximum achievable.

Figure 2. Sample Award Fee Calculation Spreadsheet